

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/849,771		05/21/2004	Maxim Levit	42339-198286	9018	
26694	7590	09/20/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385				RAHMAN,	RAHMAN, FAHMIDA	
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998				. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2116		
				DATE MAIL ED: 00/20/2000	DATE MAILED: 00/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/849,771	LEVIT, MAXIM				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Fahmida Rahman	2116				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHO WHICH - Extensi after SI - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING It ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- bly received by the Office later than three months after the maili- patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a) ☐ 1 3) ☐ 8	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 files</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ The Since this application is in condition for allowed by the practice under the pr	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro					
Dispositio	n of Claims						
5)□ (6)⊠ (7)□ (Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Applicatio	n Papers						
10)⊠ T A	he specification is objected to by the Examin he drawing(s) filed on <u>21 May 2004</u> is/are: a applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre the oath or declaration is objected to by the E	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to le drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureate the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-26 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 24 recites a machine-readable medium that provides instruction to cause the platform to perform the operations. It is not apparent whether the medium comprises any tangible embodiment as the medium can be a transmitting medium such as signals ([00012] of applicant's disclosure). For the rest of the action, it is assumed that "computer readable storage medium" is intended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Altmeid (US Patent 7036030).

Application/Control Number: 10/849,771

Art Unit: 2116

For claim 1, Altmeid teaches the following limitations:

A device (200) comprising: a chip (202); means for measuring the temperature of the

Page 3

chip (214); and means for regulating an operating voltage of the chip (230) based on the

measured temperature of the chip (228).

For claim 6, the regulator 212 is external.

For claim 8, desired operating voltage comprises minimum allowed value, since Fig 1

comprises all possible combinations including minimum allowed value of voltage.

For claim 10, Altmeid teaches the following limitations:

A device (200) comprising: a chip (202); a thermometer (214) that outputs the

temperature of said chip (304); a voltage regulator (212) coupled to the output of the

thermometer and to the chip wherein said voltage regulator reduces the operating

voltage of the chip (318) when the output of the thermometer is less than a threshold

temperature (lines 46-50 of column 4).

For claim 11, note line 29 of column 4.

For claim 13, the regulator 212 is external.

For claim 15, desired operating voltage comprises minimum allowed value, since Fig. comprises all possible combinations including minimum allowed value of voltage.

For claim 21, Altmeid teaches the following limitations:

A method, comprising: measuring the temperature of a chip while the chip is ON (304); and reducing an operating voltage delivered to the chip (lines 46-50 of column 4) when the measured temperature of the chip drops below a predefined threshold temperature (desired point is the threshold temperature).

For claim 22, Fig 1 shows the threshold temperature curve, which comprises all possible values of voltage/temperature, including the idle state. Therefore, desired points on the curve may be selected below which chip is idle.

For claim 23, reduced voltage is changed to nominal voltage, when corresponding user activity presents on the system.

For claim 24, Altmeid teaches the following limitations:

A machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a computing platform, cause said computing platform to perform operations comprising a method of: measuring the temperature of a chip while the electrical chip is ON (304); and reducing an operating voltage delivered to the chip (lines 46-50 of column 4) when Art Unit: 2116

the measured temperature of the chip drops below a predefined threshold temperature (desired point is the threshold temperature).

For claim 25, Fig 1 shows the threshold temperature curve, which comprises all possible values of voltage/temperature, including the idle state. Therefore, desired points on the curve may be selected below which chip is idle.

For claim 26, reduced voltage is changed to nominal voltage, when corresponding user activity presents on the system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmeid (US Patent 7036030).

For claims 2 and 3, processor 202 is a semiconductor device (line 29 of column 4), which is typically Si based component.

particular sensor depending on his design choice.

Art Unit: 2116

For claims 4, 5, 12, Altmejd does not mention that the sensor is a thermocouple or thermal diode. Examiner takes an official notice that thermo couple and thermal diode is well known in the art. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use that

For claims 9 and 16, 218 is not a firmware. Examiner takes an official notice that firmware storing data is well known in the art. One ordinary skill will be motivated to use firmware, since ROM is cheaper and provides non-volatile storage.

Claims 7, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmeid in view of Georgiou et al (US patent 6047248).

Altmejd does not teach any internal regulator. Georgiou et al teach an on-chip voltage regulator (Fig 1). One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have an onchip regulator to reduce the extra delay, since on-chip component takes less delay than off-chip component.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmejd in view of Kikinis (US patent 5502838).

For claim 17, Altmejd teach a set of processors but does not teach each chip has its

Page 7

own processor. Kikinis teaches a system where each processor has sensor and the

regulator regulates voltage of each processor.

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the teachings of Kikinis and Altmejd. One ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to have two chips with individual sensor and individual control of

voltage, since that would increase the performance of the system.

The combined teachings of Altmeid and Kikinis does not teach card comprising two

chips. Examiner takes official notice that a PCB comprising two chips are well known in

the art. One ordinary skill would prefer the PCB with two chips to implement the system

with a reduced size.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmejd

in view of Kikinis (US patent 5502838), further in view of Georgiou et al (US patent

6047248).

For claims 18 and 19, Altmeid teach a set of processors but does not teach each chip

has its own processor. Kikinis teaches a system where each processor has sensor and

the regulator regulates voltage of each processor.

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kikinis and Altmejd. One ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have two chips with individual sensor and individual control of voltage, since that would increase the performance of the system.

The combined teachings of Altmeid and Kikinis does not teach chip specific regulator. Georgiou et al teach the chip specific regulator (Fig 1).

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Altmeid, Kikinis and Georgiou et al. One ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have chip specific regulator, since that will increase the performance.

Combination of Altmejd, Kikinis and Georgiou et al does not teach card comprising two chips. Examiner takes official notice that a PCB comprising two chips are well known in the art. One ordinary skill would prefer the PCB with two chips to implement the system with a reduced size.

For claim 20, Examiner takes official notice that system comprising two regulators, where first regulator serves at least two chips and second regulator serving other chips are well known in the art. One ordinary skill would prefer such arrangement of regulators to ensure system's proper functionality.

Application/Control Number: 10/849,771

Art Unit: 2116

Conclusion

Page 9

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Fahmida Rahman whose telephone number is 571-272-

8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 5:30. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on 571-272-3670. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have guestions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fahmida Rahman

Examiner

Art Unit 2116

**

Ames K. Teurico

PRIMARY FRANKER

TC 2100